https://archive.org/details/bk1023/page/n0/mode/1up

1978 -Encyclopaedia of Islam -E J Brill -Vol IV (1023)

All Items on https://archive.org/details/realpatidar

ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLAM

NEW EDITION

Full Library on https://realpatidar.com/library

PREPARED BY A NUMBER OF
LEADING ORIENTALISTS

EDITED BY

E. VAN DONZEL, B. LEWIS AND CH. PELLAT

ASSISTED BY †C. DUMONT, GENERAL SECRETARY, G. R. HAWTING
AND MISS M. PATERSON, EDITORIAL SECRETARIES (pp. 1-256)

C. E. BOSWORTH, E. VAN DONZEL, B. LEWIS AND CH. PELLAT

ASSISTED BY †C. DUMONT, GENERAL SECRETARY,
AND MISS M. PATERSON, EDITORIAL SECRETARY (pp. 257-768)

ASSISTED BY F. TH. DIJKEMA, MLLE M. LEFORT AND MME S. NURIT (pp. 769-1188)

UNDER THE PATRONAGE OF
THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ACADEMIES

VOLUME IV

IRAN—KHA

LEIDEN
E. J. BRILL
1978

realpatidar.com

https://archive.org/details/bk1023/page/n1/mode/1up

Real Patidar Library

https://www.realpatidar.com/library

This book/literature/article/material may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The library does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The library shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand, or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

Full terms and conditions of use: http://www.realpatidar.com

About Real Patidar books

Real Patidar's mission is to organize the information on Satpanth religion, which is a Nizari Ismaili sect of Shia branch of Islam, and to make it universally accessible and useful. Real Patidar Books helps readers discover the material on Satpanth online while helping authors and researchers in their studies. You can know more by visiting http://www.realpatidar.com

You can resize and move this box in any PDF Application like Adobe Acrobat Reader.

No specific pages. See whole book.
References by: RealPatidar.com

https://archive.org/details/bk1023/page/n2/mode/1up

1978 -Encyclopaedia of Islam -E J Brill -Vol IV (1023)

THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLAM

realpatidar.com

NEW EDITION

PREPARED BY A NUMBER OF
LEADING ORIENTALISTS

EDITED BY

E. VAN DONZEL, B. LEWIS AND CH. PELLAT

ASSISTED BY †C. DUMONT, GENERAL SECRETARY, G. R. HAWTING
AND MISS M. PATERSON, EDITORIAL SECRETARIES (pp. 1-256)

C. E. BOSWORTH, E. VAN DONZEL, B. LEWIS AND CH. PELLAT

ASSISTED BY †C. DUMONT, GENERAL SECRETARY,
AND MISS M. PATERSON, EDITORIAL SECRETARY (pp. 257-768)

ASSISTED BY F. TH. DIJKEMA, MLLE M. LEFORT AND MME S. NURIT (pp. 769-1188)

UNDER THE PATRONAGE OF
THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ACADEMIES

VOLUME IV

IRAN—KHA

LEIDEN
E. J. BRILL
1978

realpatidar.com

https://archive.org/details/bk1023/page/n3/mode/1up

realpatidar.com

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

Members: C. C. Berg, C. E. Bosworth, J. T. P. de Bruijn, Cl. Cahen, E. van Donzel, J. van Es
R. Ettinghausen, F. Gabrieli, E. García Gómez, G. Lecomte, T. Lewicki, B. Lewin, B. Lewi
Fr. Meier, V. L. Ménage, R. Paret, *the late* J. Pedersen, Ch. Pellat, F. C. Wieder.

Associated members: Naji al-Asil, A. S. Bazmee Ansari, A. A. A. Fyzee, Halil İnalcik, Abd el-Az
Khoweitir, Ibrahim Madkour, G. H. Nasr, M. Talbi, E. Tyan.

The preparation of this volume of the Encyclopaedia of Islam wa
made possible in part through a grant from the Research Tools Pro
gram of the National Endowment for the Humanities, an independen
Federal Agency of the United States Government.

The articles in this volume were published in double fascicules of 128 pages, the dates of publication being

1973: fascs. 61-64, pp. 1-256
1974: fascs. 65-68, pp. 257-512
1975: fascs. 69-70, pp. 513-640
1976: fascs. 71-74, pp. 641-896
1977: fascs. 75-76, pp. 897-1024
1978: fascs. 77-78, pp. 1025-1188

ISBN 90 04 05745 5

Copyright 1978 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, the Netherlands
All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or translated in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, microfiche or any other means without written permission from the Editors

realpatidar.com

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

https://archive.org/details/bk1023/page/n4/mode/1up

1978 -Encyclopaedia of Islam -E J Brill -Vol IV (1023)

realpatidar.com

land, a sick and broken man, he retired from public life. Ismāʿīl Ṣidḳī died in 1948.

Bibliography: Ismāʿīl Ṣidḳī, *Muḏhakkirātī*, Cairo 1950; ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Rāfiʿī, *Thawrat sanat 1919*, Cairo 1946; idem, *Fī aʿḳāb al-thawra al-miṣrīyya*, 3 vols., Cairo 1947-51; Mahmud Y. Zayid, *Egypt's Struggle for Independence*, Beirut 1965; P. J. Vatikiotis, *The Modern History of Egypt*, London 1969. (A. KELIDAR)

ISMĀʿĪLIYYA, a major branch of the Shīʿa with numerous subdivisions. It branched off from the Imāmiyya [see ITHNĀ ʿASHARIYYA] by tracing the imāmate through Imām Djaʿfar al-Ṣādiḳ's son Ismāʿīl, after whom it is named.

History: Pre-Fāṭimid and Fāṭimid times. After the death of Djaʿfar al-Ṣādiḳ in 148/765 a group of his followers held fast to the imāmate of his son Ismāʿīl, who had been named by him as his successor but had predeceased him. Some of them maintained that Ismāʿīl had not died and would reappear as the Ḳāʾim or Mahdī. Others recognized Ismāʿīl's son Muḥammad as their imām. Nothing is known about the history of the Ismāʿīlī movement developing out of this nucleus until after the middle of the 3rd/9th century, when it appeared as a secret revolutionary organization carrying on intensive missionary efforts in many regions of the Muslim world. In the area of al-Kūfa its propaganda was spread from about the year 264/877-8 by Ḥamdān Ḳarmaṭ [*q.v.*], who was later aided by his brother-in-law ʿAbdān [*q.v.*]. Ḥamdān's followers were named after him Ḳarmaṭī, a name which came to be applied derogatorily also to other sections of the movement. In the area of al-Rayy the mission was started about the same time by Khalaf, whose followers became known as the Khalafiyya. In Fārs a brother of ʿAbdān was active. In Khurāsān Nīshāpūr and later Marw al-Rūdh became centres of Ismāʿīlī activity (see S. M. Stern, *The early Ismāʿīlī missionaries in North-West Persia and in Khurāsān and Transoxania*, in *BSOAS*, xxiii (1960), 56-90). A convert of al-Nasafī [*q.v.*], one of the *dāʿīs* of Khurāsān and Transoxania, was the first to carry the propaganda to Sidjistān, probably in the early decades of the 4th/10th century. Presumably in the first half of the 4th/10th century, the Ḳufṣ tribe in Kirmān was converted by *dāʿīs* from Khurāsān. In the Yemen two missionaries, ʿAlī b. al-Faḍl and Ibn Ḥawshab, known as Manṣūr al-Yaman [*q.v.*], in 268/881 established themselves in the area of the Djabal Maswar and succeeded in gaining strong tribal support. In 270/883 Ibn Ḥawshab sent his nephew al-Haytham as a missionary to Sind. Later he sent Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Shīʿī [*q.v.*] to the Maghrib, where he arrived in 280/893 and won the support of the Kutāma Berber tribe in western Algeria, thus laying the foundation for Fāṭimid rule. In 286/899 Abū Saʿīd al-Djannābī [*q.v.*], a follower of Ḥamdān Ḳarmaṭ and ʿAbdān, founded a Ḳarmaṭī state in al-Baḥrayn, from where he later conquered al-Ḥaṭīf, ʿUmān and al-Yamāma. The whole movement was centrally directed, at first probably from al-Ahwāz and al-Baṣra and later from Salamiyya in Syria. Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl was acknowledged as the imām, who had disappeared and was about to reappear as the Ḳāʾim and to rule the world. The leaders of the movement in the absence of the imām claimed the rank of *ḥudjdjas* [*q.v.*].

In the year 286/899, after the succession of the future Fāṭimid Caliph ʿUbayd Allāh al-Mahdī to the leadership in Salamiyya, a schism split the movement, provoked by the claim of ʿUbayd Allāh to the imāmate for himself and his ancestors. Ḥamdān Ḳarmaṭ and ʿAbdān, who may have previously drifted slightly away from the doctrine propagated by the leadership, broke off their support. ʿAbdān consequently was murdered by a subordinate *dāʿī*, Zikrawayh b. Mihrawayh [*q.v.*], who at first pretended to be loyal to the leadership. Zikrawayh and his sons organized the "Ḳarmaṭī" revolts among Syrian bedouin tribes from the year 289/902 until his capture and execution in 294/907. Doubts concerning Zikrawayh's loyalty, which soon turned out to be justified, induced ʿUbayd Allāh to leave Salamiyya for the journey which ended with his establishment as caliph in Raḳḳāda in 297/910.

Though information concerning the attitude of the various Ismāʿīlī groups following the split of the movement is scanty, the results can be summarized with some degree of probability as follows: The community in the Yemen at first remained faithful to ʿUbayd Allāh. ʿAlī b. al-Faḍl, however, in 299/913 renounced his allegiance to him and made war on Ibn Ḥawshab, who remained loyal. After ʿAlī's death in 303/915 his party disintegrated rapidly. The *dāʿīs* in the Maghrib and probably in Sind, having been sent by Ibn Ḥawshab, also remained loyal. There are indications that the *daʿwa* in Khurāsān generally maintained its allegiance to ʿUbayd Allāh, who was able to appoint some *dāʿīs* there, but there were probably also counter-currents. The communities in ʿIrāḳ, al-Baḥrayn, and western Persia refused to recognize the Fāṭimid claim to the imāmate. Among the Ḳarmaṭīs of ʿIrāḳ ʿĪsā b. Mūsā, a nephew of ʿAbdān, continued the latter's work propagating the imāmate of Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl, who would return as the Ḳāʾim. After 320/932 he was active in Baghdād. He and other *dāʿīs* in ʿIrāḳ ascribed their writings to ʿAbdān, thus stressing the doctrinal continuity. The *dāʿīs* of al-Rayy were in close contact with those in ʿIrāḳ and with the Ḳarmaṭīs of al-Baḥrayn and like them were expecting the reappearance of the Mahdī-imām for the year 316/928. At least in the twenties of the 4th century (1030-9) they controlled the missions in Mosul and Baghdād. They worked successfully among the Daylamīs and won at least the temporary allegiance of Daylamī leaders like Asfār, Mardāwīdj and later of some rulers of the Musāfirid dynasty. The Ḳarmaṭīs of al-Baḥrayn, led by Abū Ṭāhir al-Djannābī, were predicting the appearance of the Mahdī-imām for the year 316/928. In 319/931 they accepted a Persian prisoner of war as the Expected One, and Abū Ṭāhir turned the rule over to him. The early disastrous end of the affair weakened the ideological vigour of the Ḳarmaṭīs of al-Baḥrayn and their influence among the *dāʿīs* in ʿIrāḳ and Persia, but did not generally lead to an expansion of Fāṭimid influence. Soon afterwards the great revolt of the Khāridjī Abū Yazīd [*q.v.*] under the Fāṭimid Caliphs al-Ḳāʾim and al-Manṣūr stifled any Fāṭimid activity among the eastern Ismāʿīlī communities. Only the fourth Fāṭimid, al-Muʿizz (341/953-365/975), was in a position to lead an intensive campaign to regain the allegiance of the schismatic Ismāʿīlīs. His efforts were partially successful, but failed in regard to the Ḳarmaṭīs of al-Baḥrayn, whose hostility erupted, after the Fāṭimid conquest of Egypt in 358/969, in open warfare against the Fāṭimid armies. After concluding a peace with the Fāṭimid al-ʿAzīz in 369/979-80 and a severe defeat by a bedouin tribe in 378/988, the Ḳarmaṭīs of al-Baḥrayn were reduced to a local power unable to exert any ideological influence beyond its boundaries. The movement still supporting the doctrine of the return of Muḥammad

realpatidar.com

Link: http://www.realpatidar.com/library
email: mail@realpatidar.com

https://archive.org/details/bk1023/page/n5/mode/1up

1978 -Encyclopaedia of Islam -E J Brill -Vol IV (1023)

realpatidar.com

b. Ismāʿīl rapidly disintegrated about the same time. The Ḳarmaṭī state in al-Baḥrayn survived until 470/1077-8. (See M. J. de Goeje, *Mémoire sur les Carmathes du Bahraïn*², Leiden 1886; idem, *La fin de l'empire des Carmathes*, in *JA* 9th ser. v (1895), 5-30; W. Madelung, *Fatimiden und Baḥrainqarmaṭen*, in *Isl.* xxxiv (1959), 34-88; S. M. Stern, *Ismāʿīlīs and Qarmaṭians*, in *l'Élaboration de l'Islam*, Paris 1961, 99-108).

In the time of al-Muʿizz a Fāṭimid vassal state was established in Multān in Sind. The Ismāʿīlī *dāʿī* there succeeded before 348/959 in converting a local ruler. Multān became an Ismāʿīlī stronghold where the *ḵẖuṭba* was read in the name of the Fāṭimid caliph. This success probably strengthened the Fāṭimid cause also in the neighbouring regions, for in Mukrān the *ḵẖuṭba* was also read for the Fāṭimids about the year 378/988. The *dāʿī* Abū Yaʿḳūb al-Sidjistānī [*q.v.*], who supported the Fāṭimid doctrine at least from the time of al-Muʿizz on, probably was active in Sidjistān before his death in the second half of the 4th/10th century. In Djīruft in Kirmān a Fāṭimid *dāʿī* was residing toward the end of the 4th/10th century. The Ismāʿīlī state in Multān lasted until 401/1010-1, when Maḥmūd of Ghazna annexed the town, took its ruler prisoner and massacred many Ismāʿīlīs (see S. M. Stern, *Ismāʿīlī propaganda and Fāṭimid rule in Sind*, in *IC*, xxiii (1949), 298-307).

During the last years of the reign of al-Ḥākim (386/996-411/1021) extremist Ismāʿīlīs in Cairo began to proclaim the divinity of this Fāṭimid caliph. Their leadership soon passed to Ḥamza b. ʿAlī [*q.v.*], who became the founder of the Druze religious doctrine. The official Fāṭimid *daʿwa* organization remained adamantly opposed to this movement, although al-Ḥākim at times showed it favour. After al-Ḥākim's death it was persecuted by the Fāṭimid government and wiped out in Cairo, but succeeded in solidifying its hold over the mountainous regions in Syria which, with some modifications, became the permanent home of the Druze community. The Druze religion [see DURŪZ], though derived from Ismāʿīlī doctrine, transformed its basic ideas to such a degree as to be usually considered as falling outside the range of Ismāʿīlism.

In Ifrīḳiya the Ismāʿīlī communities were practically exterminated by popular riots after the accession of al-Muʿizz b. Bādīs, Zīrid vassal of the Fāṭimids, in 407/1016. The missionary efforts of the Fāṭimids during their residence in Ifrīḳiyya had achieved the conversion of only small groups of the urban population, while the masses, led by the Mālikī *ʿulamāʾ*, were solidly opposed to Fāṭimid rule and Shīʿism. Large numbers of Kutāma tribesmen, who traditionally furnished the main body of the Fāṭimid army, left for Egypt with the Fāṭimid al-Muʿizz. Most of the leading *dāʿī*s also departed at that time. The Ṣanhādja tribe, which supported Zīrid rule, only superficially adhered to Ismāʿīlism. During the year 407/1016-7 the Ismāʿīlīs in al-Ḳayrawān, al-Manṣūriyya, al-Mahdiyya, Tūnis, Tripoli, and other towns were attacked and massacred by the populace with the countenance of the government. Sporadic massacres took place also during the following years. The Ismāʿīlī communities were thus extinguished long before al-Muʿizz in 440/1049 renounced his allegiance to the Fāṭimids and recognized ʿAbbāsid suzereignty (see H. R. Idris, *La Berbérie orientale sous les Zīrides*, Paris 1962, 143-9).

During the reign of the Caliph al-Mustanṣir (427/1036-487/1094) the Ismāʿīlī cause achieved new successes in the Yemen and India. In the Yemen the *daʿwa* after the death of Ibn Ḥawshab had suffered major setbacks and survived only precariously, though in the period 379/989-387/997 it had gained the allegiance and support of the Yaʿfurid amīr ʿAbd Allāh b. Ḳaḥṭān, ruler of Ṣanʿāʾ and conqueror of Zabīd from the Ziyādids. In 429/1038 ʿAlī b. Muḥammad al-Ṣulayḥī, Fāṭimid *dāʿī* and founder of the Ṣulayḥid dynasty, rose in Masār in the Ḥarāz region. Through the activity of the Ṣulayḥids [*q.v.*] Fāṭimid sovereignty came to extend over all of the Yemen and temporarily over other parts of Arabia like ʿUmān and al-Baḥrayn (see Ḥ. F. al-Ḥamdānī, *al-Ṣulayḥiyyūn*, Cairo 1955). The Ṣulayḥids also furthered renewed efforts at spreading Ismāʿīlism on the Indian subcontinent. Although parts of the Ismāʿīlī community in Sind evidently had survived the persecution under Maḥmūd of Ghazna and Ismāʿīlism seems to have been espoused by the Sūmra dynasty of local Hindu origin (see A. H. al-Hamdani, *The Beginnings of the Ismāʿīlī Daʿwa in Northern India*, Cairo 1956), contacts with the Fāṭimid *daʿwa* faded. The Ismāʿīlīs in Sind may have drifted partially back to Hindu practices and beliefs. A new Ismāʿīlī community was now founded by Yemenite *dāʿī*s in the area of Cambay, Gudjarāt, which had close commercial ties with the Yemen. According to the traditional account an Arab *dāʿī*, ʿAbd Allāh, arrived with two Indian assistants in Gudjarāt in 460/1068, sent by the Yemenite chief *dāʿī* Lamak b. Mālik. Less than a decade later the existence of a flourishing Ismāʿīlī community is confirmed by official letters of the Fāṭimid chancery. This new Ismāʿīlī community remained closely tied to, and controlled by, the Yemenite *daʿwa* and was the nucleus of the modern Bohorā [*q.v.*] community.

After the middle of the 5th/11th century the Persian poet and philosopher Nāṣir-i Khusraw [*q.v.*] was active as a Fāṭimid *dāʿī* in Yumgān in the Upper Oxus area for over 15 years. Expelled from Balkh because of Ismāʿīlī activity, he came to Yumgān before 453/1061 and remained there until his death. Several of his extant philosophical and religious works were composed there. He became the founder and patron-saint of the Ismāʿīlī community of Badakhshān in the wider sense, though it may have been changed in composition by later Ismāʿīlī refugees (see W. Ivanow, *Problems in Nasir-i Khosraw's Biography*, Bombay 1956; A. E. Bertel's, *Nasir-i Khosrov i Ismailizm*, Moscow 1959).

In the last years of the reign of al-Mustanṣir the Ismāʿīlī cause in Persia was reinvigorated by the activity of Ḥasan-i Ṣabbāḥ [*q.v.*]. After travelling widely and carrying on propaganda in various regions of the country, he seized the fortress of Alamūt [*q.v.*] in the mountains of Daylam in 483/1090, thus opening a new phase in the Ismāʿīlī activity in Persia. The clandestine missionary work to which the *daʿwa* in Persia had mostly been restricted was replaced by a policy of open revolt which, in the face of the overwhelming military strength of the Saldjūḳ government, was based on the seizure of impregnable mountain fortresses and spectacular political murder aimed at intimidating the enemy's leadership. In the following years other rock fortresses were occupied in the Elburz range. In 484 or 485/1091-2 Ḥasan-i Ṣabbāḥ sent the *dāʿī* Ḥusayn Ḳāʾinī to Ḳuhistān to raise the revolt there. In short order the Ismāʿīlīs seized control of several towns in eastern Ḳuhistān, Ṭabas, Ḳāʾin, Zūzan, Tūn, and others. Another *dāʿī*, Abū Ḥamza, captured two castles near Arradjān in the border region between Fārs and Khūzistān. After the death of al-Mus-

realpatidar.com

Link: http://www.realpatidar.com/library
email: mail@realpatidar.com

https://archive.org/details/bk1023/page/n6/mode/1up

1978 -Encyclopaedia of Islam -E J Brill -Vol IV (1023)

realpatidar.com

tanṣir in 487/1094, a major split occurred in the Ismāʿīlī movement concerning the succession to the imāmate. Al-Mustanṣir had originally designated his eldest son, Nizār [*q.v.*], as his heir. Later his youngest son, Aḥmad, found the support of the vizier al-Afḍal [*q.v.*], who after the death of al-Mustanṣir placed him on the throne with the title al-Mustaʿlī [*q.v.*]. Nizār fled to Alexandria, where he rose in revolt, was defeated, seized and immured. Ḥasan-i Ṣabbāḥ and the Persian Ismāʿīlīs upheld the right of Nizār to the succession and refused to recognize al-Mustaʿlī. In the absence of the imām, Ḥasan-i Ṣabbāḥ became the supreme chief claiming the rank of *ḥudjdja*. After his death the leadership continued with the rulers of Alamūt. Beginning with the fourth ruler, Ḥasan *ʿalā dhikrihi 'l-salām* (557/1162-561/1166), they came to be recognized as imāms. Against numerous Saldjūḳ attacks the Nizārīs were able to hold and expand their territories in the Elburz mountains and Ḳuhistān. The fortress Shāhdiz near Iṣfahān, which they seized about the year 494/1100, was lost again in 500/1107. Some time afterwards the Nizārī fortresses near Arradjān were overcome. Among the Ismāʿīlīs in Egypt and Syria there were also partisans of Nizār. In Egypt they were gradually suppressed. In Syria, which fell largely outside the Fāṭimid territory, they were soon organized by emissaries from Alamūt and and seriously rivalled the supporters of the Fāṭimid caliphate, especially in Damascus and Aleppo. The Djabal al-Summāḳ and surrounding area north of Ḥamāt soon became a stronghold of the Nizārīs. As in Persia they aimed at acquiring fortresses, but failed in their first attempts, and practised political murder. In 520/1126 Tughtagīn, ruler of Damascus, ceded to them the fortress of Bānyās on the frontier with the Franks and gave them official recognition in Damascus. His son Būrī in 523/1139 encouraged anti-Ismāʿīlī rioting in Damascus in which the Nizārī community was virtually wiped out. The fortress of Bānyās was consequently surrendered by the Nizārīs to the Franks. Soon afterwards they achieved lasting success in the Djabal Bahrāʾ area west of Ḥamāt. In 527/1132-3 they acquired the fortress of Ḳadmūs, and other fortresses came into their possession during the following decade. Maṣyāf, the most important stronghold, was seized in 535/1140-1. The Syrian Nizārīs continued to be ruled by agents sent by the lords of Alamūt. The most famous one, Rāshid al-Dīn Sinān [*q.v.*] (557/1162-588/1192), showed signs of independence, and there are reports that agents were repeatedly sent from Alamūt to kill him. A complete break was avoided.

The imāmate of al-Mustaʿlī was recognized by most Ismāʿīlīs in Egypt, many in Syria, and by the whole community in the Yemen and that in India dependent on it. A new schism developed, however, among the Mustaʿlian Ismāʿīlīs after the assassination of al-Mustaʿlī's son and successor al-Āmir [*q.v.*] in 524/1130. Eight months before al-Āmir's death a son, al-Ṭayyib, had been born to him and had immediately been proclaimed as his heir. After al-Āmir's death his cousin ʿAbd al-Madjīd was put on the throne in Cairo as regent, officially in expectation of the delivery of a pregnant wife of the late caliph. Mention of the infant al-Ṭayyib was suppressed, and nothing is known about his fate. Four days later ʿAbd al-Madjīd was overthrown and imprisoned by al-Afḍal Kutayfāt [*q.v.*], who declared the Fāṭimid dynasty deposed and proclaimed the sovereignty of the Twelfth Imām of the Imāmiyya. Kutayfāt was overthrown and killed in Muḥ. 526/Dec. 1131, and ʿAbd al-Madjīd returned to the throne as regent. In Rabīʿ II 526/Feb. 1132 he was proclaimed imām with the caliphal title al-Ḥāfiẓ [*q.v.*]. The succession of al-Ḥāfiẓ, though in violation of the accepted rule that the imāmate could be inherited only by a direct descendant, was supported by the official *daʿwa* organization in Egypt and accepted by the majority of the Mustaʿlian Ismāʿīlīs in Egypt and Syria. They were known as the Ḥāfiẓiyya or Madjīdiyya. There were, however, some Mustaʿlian communities in Egypt and Syria which continued to support the rights of al-Ṭayyib and were known as Āmiriyya. In the Yemen most of the leaders of the established *daʿwa* organization upheld the rights of al-Ṭayyib. Encouraged by the Ṣulayḥid queen al-Sayyida they founded the independent Ṭayyibī *daʿwa* in the Yemen headed by a *dāʿī muṭlaḳ*. The first of these was al-Dhuʾayb b. Mūsā, who was succeeded in 546/1151 by Ibrāhīm al-Ḥāmidī [*q.v.*]. The Ṭayyibī *dāʿīs* worked successfully despite the fact that after the death of the Ṣulayḥid queen in 532/1138 they did not have the support of any of the rulers in the Yemen. The Ḥāfiẓī *daʿwa* was supported by the Zuraydʿids of ʿAdan, who, beginning with Muḥammad b. Sabaʾ, were officially appointed Fāṭimid *dāʿīs* in the Yemen, and by at least some of the Hamdānid rulers of Ṣanʿāʾ (see S. M. Stern, *The succession to the Fatimid Imam al-Āmir, the claims of the later Fatimids to the Imamate, and the rise of Ṭayyibī Ismailism*, in *Oriens*, iv (1951), 193-255). There are no reports as to whether the Ḥāfiẓī *daʿwa* ever had adherents in India. In any case the community in India, which continued to be closely tied to the Yemenite *daʿwa*, soon was solidly Ṭayyibī.

The post-Fāṭimid period. Ḥāfiẓiyya: After the overthrow of the Fāṭimid caliphate in 567/1171 the Ḥāfiẓiyya, no longer enjoying official support, gradually disintegrated. Al-ʿĀḍid, the last Fāṭimid caliph, had appointed his son Dāʾūd as his successor with the title al-Ḥāmid li'llāh. Dāʾūd was generally recognized by the Ḥāfiẓīs as the imām after al-ʿĀḍid. He and all other members of the Fāṭimid family were permanently detained as prisoners by the Ayyūbids. As a result of a pro-Fāṭimid conspiracy in Cairo in 568/1172-3 many of the supporters of the deposed dynasty were exiled to Upper Egypt, which became a hotbed of pro-Fāṭimid activity. In 572/1176-7 a pretender claiming to be Dāʾūd found wide support in Ḳift. When the real Dāʾūd died as a prisoner in Cairo in 604/1207-8, the Ḥāfiẓīs asked the Ayyūbid al-Malik al-Kāmil for permission to mourn him in public. Al-Kāmil granted them permission, but used the occasion to arrest their *dāʿīs* and confiscate their property. After Dāʾūd his son Sulaymān mostly seems to have been recognized as the imām. Sulaymān died without child as a prisoner in 645/1248, but some of his partisans claimed that he had a son who was hidden (see P. Casanova, *Les derniers Fâṭimides*, in *MIFAO*, vi (1897), 415-45). In 697/1298 a pretender appeared in Upper Egypt who claimed to be Dāʾūd b. Sulaymān b. Dāʾūd. Still later, about the year 723/1324, Ismāʿīlīs are mentioned in ʿUṣfūn in Upper Egypt. In Syria a Ḥāfiẓī community is mentioned at the same time in the Baḳīʿa mountains near Ṣafad. In the Yemen the Ḥāfiẓī cause also lost all official backing with the Ayyūbid conquest. The Ṭayyibī *dāʿī muṭlaḳ* ʿAlī b. Muḥammad al-Walīd (d. 612/1215) still composed polemical treatises and poems against the "Madjīdiyya", but they were already becoming a rare minority.

Ṭayyibiyya [*q.v.*]: The insignificant Ṭayyibī communities in Egypt and Syria, known as Āmiriyya, are only rarely mentioned in the sources. Toward the end of the 6th/12th century there is a vague reference

realpatidar.com

Link: http://www.realpatidar.com/library
email: mail@realpatidar.com

https://archive.org/details/bk1023/page/n7/mode/1up

1978 -Encyclopaedia of Islam -E J Brill -Vol IV (1023)

realpatidar.com

to the Druzes. From Andiyya in Egypt, in Syria a community of Andiyya is still mentioned about the year 744/1344 in the Ḥabīʾa and Zāhūd mountains near Ṣafad. These isolated communities probably did not survive much longer. Only in the Yemen and India could the Tayyibī *daʿwa*, under the undisputed leadership of the *daʿī muṭlaḳ*, establish itself permanently. After Ḥasan al-Ḥāmidī the position of *daʿī muṭlaḳ* remained among his descendants until 605/1209, when it passed to ʿAlī b. Muḥammad of the Banū ʾl-Walīd al-Anf family, which was named after his ancestor Ḥasan al-Anf, who was a prominent supporter of the Ṣulayḥids and a descendant of the Umayyad al-Walīd b. ʿUtba b. Abī Sufyān. It remained in this family, with only two interruptions in the 7th/13th century, until 946/1539. The traditional stronghold of the Ismāʿīlī *daʿwa* in the Yemen was in the Ḥarāz [*q.v.*] mountains, though there were scattered communities in other parts of the country. The *daʿīs* generally enjoyed the support, or at least protection, of the Ḥamdānids [*q.v.*], who permitted them to reside in Ṣanʿāʾ and later, in the 8th/14th century, in the fortress of Dhū Marmar. Their relations with the Ayyūbids and the Rasūlids were fair, but the Zaydī imāms were mostly hostile. The Zaydī pretender al-Manṣūr ʿAlī b. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn expelled them from Dhū Marmar in 829/1426 after a prolonged siege, and they established their residence in the Ḥarāz mountains. The Zaydī Imām al-Muṭahhar b. Sharaf al-Dīn in the 10th/16th century relentlessly persecuted the Banū ʾl-Anf and seems to have practically extirpated the family. The relations with the *daʿwa* in India remained close. There the Tayyibī community grew mostly undisturbed, though in the first half of the 9th/15th century persecution under the Sultanate of Gudjarāt resulted in mass conversions to Sunnism. In 946/1539 the position of *dāʿī muṭlaḳ* passed to an Indian, and after his death in 947/1567 the headquarters were transferred to Gudjarāt in India.

After the death of Dāʾūd b. ʿAdjabshāh, the 26th *dāʿī muṭlaḳ*, in 999/1591, the succession was disputed. While in India Dāʾūd Burhān al-Dīn was established, Dāʾūd b. Adjabshāh's representative in the Yemen, Sulaymān b. al-Ḥasan al-Hindī, claimed to have been designated successor by the deceased *dāʿī muṭlaḳ*. The dispute was not resolved and led to the permanent schism between the Dāʾūdī and Sulaymānī factions which accepted separate lines of *dāʿīs*. Among the Sulaymānīs, whose cause had only few adherents in India, the position of *dāʿī muṭlaḳ* in 1050/1640 passed to the Yemenite Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad b. Fahd of the Makramī [*q.v.*] family, in which it has remained since with few interruptions. The Makramī *dāʿīs* established themselves in Nadjrān [*q.v.*], where they were supported by the Banū Yām [*q.v.*]. Before 1131/1719 they conquered the Ḥarāz region in the Yemen and held it against all attempts of the Zaydī imāms to expel them. The Dāʿī al-Ḥasan b. Hibat Allāh (d. 1189/1775) conquered Ḥaḍramawt and unsuccessfully fought the rising Suʿūdī dynasty in Central Arabia. From Ḥarāz the Makramīs were expelled in 1289/1872 by the Ottoman general Aḥmad Mukhtār Pasha, who took their fortress ʿAttāra and treacherously killed the Dāʿī al-Ḥasan b. Ismāʿīl Āl Shibām al-Makramī. The present *dāʿī muṭlaḳ* of the Sulaymānīs is Djamāl al-Dīn ʿAlī b. al-Ḥusayn al-Makramī, who succeeded his father in 1939 (see A. A. A. Fyzee, *Three Sulaymānī Dāʿīs: 1936-1939*, in *JBBRAS*, xvi (1940), 101-4). Besides the Banū Yām in Nadjrān, the people of the Djabal Maghāriba in Ḥarāz are Sulaymānīs. In India the Sulaymānī *daʿīs* are represented by *manṣūbs* residing in Baroda. Sulaymānīs live mainly in Bombay, Baroda, and Ḥaydarābād, Dekkan.

The Dāʾūdī *daʿīs* after the split continued to reside in India, where the great majority of their followers live. The *daʿwa* generally was able to develop freely, though there was another wave of persecution under Awrangzīb (1044/1635-1118/1707). Since 1200/1785 the headquarters of the *dāʿīs* have been in Surat. The present *dāʿī muṭlaḳ* is Muḥammad Burhān al-Dīn, who succeeded his father Ṭāhir Sayf al-Dīn in 1966. Dāʾūdī Ismāʿīlīs live chiefly in Gudjarāt, Bombay, and Central India. In Yemen there are Dāʾūdīs in the Ḥarāz region. (For minor secessions from the Dāʾūdīs (see BOHORĀS).

Nizāriyya [*q.v.*]: The imāmate of the Nizārīs remained vested in the lords of Alamūt until the surrender of the fortress to the Mongol conqueror Hulāgū in 654/1256 and the consequent execution of the imām Rukn al-Dīn Khurshāh. Practically nothing is known about the imāms following him. Later lists of the imāms differ widely concerning their names, number, and sequence. The list now considered official in the Āghā Khānī branch has come to be generally accepted only since the later 19th century. There are vague indications that the imāms after the fall of Alamūt resided in Ādharbāydjān. A split occurred in the line of imāms after Muḥammad Shams al-Dīn, usually considered the son of Khurshāh, or his son Muʾmin-Shāh, who is omitted in some lists. One line continues with Ḳāsim-Shāh, the other with Muḥammad-Shāh. The Ḳāsim-Shāhī imāms in the latter part of the 9th/15th century resided in Andjudān, a village near Maḥallāt, where the tombs of some of them are preserved. From this time until the 19th century the imāms were usually affiliated to the Niʿmat Allāhī Ṣūfī order. After a lapse of nearly one and a half centuries there are further tombs of imāms in Andjudān dating from 1043/1634 to 1090/1680. It is unknown where the family lived in the intervening period. Imām Shāh Nizār, who died in 1134/1722 is buried in Kahak, a village near Andjudān (see W. Ivanow, *Tombs of some Persian Ismaʿili Imams*, in *JBBRAS*, xiv (1938), 49-62). In the time of Nādir Shāh (1148/1736-1160/1747) Imām Sayyid Ḥasan Beg moved to Shahr-i Bābak and acquired a winter residence in Kirmān. The imāms now rose from their previous obscurity to involvement in political life. Imām Abu ʾl-Ḥasan Shāh was governor of Kirmān from 1169/1756 until his death in 1206/1791-2. His son Shāh Khalīl Allāh, who enjoyed the favour of the Ḳādjār Fatḥ ʿAlī Shāh, returned to Kahak and later moved to Yazd, where he was killed by a mob in 1232/1817. Khalīl Allāh's son, Ḥasan ʿAlī Shāh Maḥallātī, was granted by Fatḥ ʿAlī Shāh the title Āghā Khān [*q.v.*], which has remained hereditary among his successors. After a vain attempt at gaining independent rule of Kirmān, Ḥasan ʿAlī Shāh moved to India in 1259/1843 (see H. Algar, *The Revolt of Āghā Khān Maḥallātī and the Transference of the Ismāʿīlī Imamate to India*, in *SI*, xxix (1969), 55-81). Bombay became the permanent seat of the imāmate. The present (1971) Āghā Khān, Karīm Khān, succeeded his grandfather, Sulṭān Muḥammad Shāh, in 1957.

The branch of Muḥammad-Shāh apparently was closely associated with the Nizārī community in Daylam. In 776/1374-5 Khudāwand Muḥammad, who may be identical with Muḥammad-Shāh, gained possession of the fortress of Alamūt with the support of the local Nizārīs. He was consequently expelled and sought refuge with Tīmūr, who sent him

realpatidar.com

Link: http://www.realpatidar.com/library
email: mail@realpatidar.com

https://archive.org/details/bk1023/page/n8/mode/1up

1978 -Encyclopaedia of Islam -E J Brill -Vol IV (1023)

realpatidar.com

to confinement in Sulṭāniyya. The family continued to live in Sulṭāniyya until after 894/1489. Members of it, however, were repeatedly active among the Nizārīs in Daylam until the middle of the 9th/15th century. The most famous imām of the Muḥammad-Shāhī line, Shāh Ṭāhir Ḥusaynī Dakkanī, because of his religious following aroused the suspicion of the Ṣafawid Shāh Ismāʿīl, was exiled to Kāshān and later forced to leave Persia. In 928/1522 he came to Aḥmadnagar in the Dekkan, where he was instrumental in bringing about the proclamation of Shīʿism as the official religion by the ruler Burhān Niẓām Shāh. Shāh Ṭāhir probably died in 956/1549. His descendants lived in Aḥmadnagar and later in Awrangābād (see W. Ivanow, *A forgotten branch of the Ismailis*, in *JRAS*, 1938, 57-79). The last imām of this branch, so far as is known, was Amīr Muḥammad Bāḳir, whose last contact with his Syrian followers was in 1210/1796. As well as in Daylam, the Muḥammad-Shāhī line had supporters in Badakhshān and the Kabūl area in the 10th/16th and 11th/17th centuries, though by the beginning of the 13th/19th century the Ismāʿīlīs there seem to have generally adhered to the Ḳāsim-Shāhī line. The community in Syria generally recognized the Muḥammad-Shāhī line. In a period of troubles contact with the Imām Muḥammad Bāḳir was lost after the year 1210/1796. In 1304/1887, after a vain search for descendants of Muḥammad Bāḳir, a section of the Syrian community recognized the Āghā Khānī line. In 1957 about 30,000 Syrian Nizārīs, living in Salamiyya and the villages of al-Khawābī, adhered to the Āghā Khānī line. About 15,000, known as Djaʿfariyya and living in Ḳadmūs, Maṣyāf, and some villages near Salamiyya, continued to adhere to the Muḥammad-Shāhī line (see ʿĀ. Tāmir, *Furūʿ al-shadjara al-Ismāʿīliyya al-Imāmiyya*, in *al-Mashriḳ*, li (1957), 581-612).

The Nizārī communities, widely dispersed territorially and partially separated by language barriers, developed largely independently of each other, especially after the fall of Alamūt. They were led by local leaders, *shaykh*s or *pīr*s, who alone could claim access to the hidden imāms. The Syrian Nizārīs during the later Alamūt period continued to be ruled by Persian agents sent by the imāms. After the fall of Alamūt they at first preserved their political independence and joined the Muslim efforts to expel the Mongol invaders in 658/1260 from Syria, but later were gradually subdued by the Mamlūk Sultan Baybars I. By the end of the year 671/1273 Baybars controlled all their fortresses. The Ismāʿīlīs remained subjects of the Mamlūks and later of the Ottomans, paying a special tax. During the late 18th and the 19th centuries they were frequently involved in clashes with their neighbours, especially with the numerically stronger Nuṣayrīs, who repeatedly occupied their fortresses. About the middle of the 19th century the Ismāʿīlīs restored the town of Salamiyya [*q.v.*] and settled the surrounding area east of Ḥamāt, where now approximately two thirds of the community live. The last Nuṣayrī attack and occupation of Ḳadmūs took place in 1920, causing much damage to property and manuscripts (see N. N. Lewis, *The Ismāʿīlīs of Syria today*, in *Royal Central Asian Studies Journal*, (1952), 69-77).

In Persia the Ismāʿīlī communities were decimated by massacres but survived after the surrender of Alamūt and the other fortresses in Daylam and Ḳuhistān. Alamūt was briefly reoccupied in 674/1275, but lost again in the next year. In the second half of the 8th/14th and the first half of the 9th/15th centuries it was repeatedly, though only for short spans of time, in Nizārī hands. The Nizārī community in Daylam was still a force in the local power struggle in this period, though it was usually on the defensive, especially against the Zaydī rulers of Lāhīdjān. After this time it gradually disappeared. In Ḳuhistān small Ismāʿīlī communities have survived in the area of Ḳāʾin and Bīrdjand. Other Nizārī communities are found in the area of Nīshāpūr in Khurāsān, around Kirmān, in Sīrdjān and the Djabal Bāriz, and in the area of Maḥallāt and Yazd.

The Ismāʿīlīs of the Upper Oxus region seem to have accepted the Nizārī imāmate before the end of the Alamūt period, though the exact date and circumstances are unknown. Local tradition in Shughnān [*q.v.*] mentions two *dāʿī*s, Sayyid Shāh Mālıng and Shāh Khāmūsh, who were sent by the imām and became the founders of the dynasties of *pīr*s and *mīr*s ruling Shughnān. In 913/1507-8 Shāh Raḍiyy al-Dīn, who is perhaps to be identified with the imām of the Muḥammad-Shāhī line of that name, the father of Shāh Ṭāhir Dakkanī, came from Sīstān to Badakhshān and with the support of the local Ismāʿīlīs established his rule over large parts of the region. In consequence of quarrels among his supporters he was killed in spring 1509. In the 11th/17th century another imām of the Muḥammad-Shāhī line, Khudaybakhsh, seems to have taken up residence in Badakhshān and died there in 1074/1663-4. The Ismāʿīlī communities continued to be guided by local dynasties of *pīr*s. There are Nizārī communities recognizing the Āghā Khāns also in the area of Ghazna, in Chitral, Gilgit, Hunza, where they are known as Mawlāʾīs, and in the area of Yārkand and Kāshghar.

The date and circumstances of the introduction of Nizārī Ismāʿīlism in India are obscure. A continuity of Ismāʿīlī activity in Sind, especially the Multān area, ever since the early *daʿwa* there, is attested by sparse notices in the sources. In the first half of the 7th/13th century this activity extended to Dihlī. It may at this time well have been inspired by emissaries of the imāms of Alamūt, but definite evidence is lacking. The first *pīr*s mentioned in the religious literature of the Indian Nizārīs cannot be dated with any degree of certainty. The shrine of the earliest one, Satgur Nūr, is in Nawsari in Gudjarāt, where the religious texts place his activity. The presence of non-Ṭayyibī Ismāʿīlīs in Gudjarāt is vaguely attested for the first half of the 7th/13th century. Pīr Shams al-Dīn according to the texts came from Persia to Sind and became the founder of the dynasty of *pīr*s there. If the traditional pedigree of *pīr*s is reliable, he may have lived in the first half of the 8th/14th century, as some sources suggest. Other sources date him one or two centuries earlier. His mausoleum is in Multān. Pīr Ṣadr al-Dīn and Pīr Ḥasan Kabīr al-Dīn of the 9th/15th century are buried near Uch, south of Multān. Ṣadr al-Dīn is traditionally considered the founder and organizer of the Khodja [*q.v.*] community, which consists mostly of converts of the Hindu Lohana caste. Kabīr al-Dīn's son Imām-Shāh after about the year 875/1470-1 was active in Gudjarāt where he converted numerous Hindus.

Imām-Shāh died in 926/1520 and is buried in Pīrāna near Aḥmadābād. His son and successor Nar (Nūr) Muḥammad-Shāh (d.940/1533-4) repudiated the recognition of the imām in Persia and claimed the imāmate for himself, thus founding a separate sect whose adherents are known as Imām-Shāhīs or Satpanthīs. The sect later split further around different lines of *pīr*s. It has tended to revert toward Hinduism. Its followers, who are to be found chiefly in Gudjarāt

Link: http://www.realpatidar.com/library
email: mail@realpatidar.com

https://archive.org/details/bk1023/page/n9/mode/1up

1978 -Encyclopaedia of Islam -E J Brill -Vol IV (1023)

and Khōdjesh, consider themselves mostly as Imāmī Shīʿīs or Sunnīs rather than Ismāʿīlīs, though they recognize the Ismāʿīlī imāms before the split (see W. Ivanow, *The sect of Imam Shah in Gujrat*, in *JBBRAS*, xxii (1936), 19-70). Other Nizārīs in Gudjarāt remained faithful to the imāms in Persia. The great majority of Nizārīs on the Indian subcontinent belong to the Khodja community. There are, however, other Nizārī groups, such as the Shamsīs, followers of Pīr Shams al-Dīn in Pandjāb and others. The Khodjas live chiefly in lower Sind, Cutch, Gudjarāt, Bombay, and in diaspora in East and South Africa, Ceylon, and Burma.

Doctrine. Pre-Fāṭimid and Fāṭimid times: Nothing definite is known about the doctrine of the early supporters of the imāmate of Ismāʿīl and his son Muḥammad. Imāmī sources maintain that the Khaṭṭābiyya [*q.v.*], the followers of the extremist Shīʿī Abu 'l-Khaṭṭāb [*q.v.*], constituted the bulk of the early Ismāʿiliyya. Later Ismāʿīlī doctrine, however, generally condemns Abu 'l-Khaṭṭāb and does not appear to be substantially influenced by the heresies ascribed to him and his followers (see W. Ivanow, *Ibn al-Qaddāḥ*, Bombay 1957). The *Umm al-kitāb* preserved by the Ismāʿīlīs of Badakhshān, in which Abu 'l-Khaṭṭāb appears as a saintly disciple of Imām Muḥammad al-Bāḳir and his sons are called the founders of Ismāʿīlism, is a syncretistic compilation written not earlier than the beginning of the 4th/10th century and perhaps as late as the early Alamūt period. The ideas of the Shīʿī *ghulāt* [*q.v.*] represented in it are for the most part not specifically Ismāʿīlī and evidently not derived from Ismāʿīlī sources. The work thus must not be considered "proto-Ismāʿīlī".

The doctrine propagated by the pre-Fāṭimid Ismāʿīlī revolutionary movement of the second half of the 3rd/9th century can be derived in its outlines from later Ismāʿīlī works and reports of anti-Ismāʿīlī authors. It embodied already the basic framework of the later Ismāʿīlī religious system, though it was consequently modified in some important respects. Fundamental was the distanction between the *ẓāhir* exterior or exoteric, and the *bāṭin* [see BĀṬINIYYA], inward or esoteric, aspects of religion. The *ẓāhir* consists in the apparent, generally accepted meaning of the revealed scriptures and in the religious law laid down in them. It changes with each prophet. The *bāṭin* consists in the truths (*ḥaḳāʾiḳ*) concealed in the scriptures and laws, which are unchangeable and are made apparent from them by the *taʾwīl* [*q.v.*], interpretation, which is often of a cabalistic nature relying on the mystical significance of letters and numbers. These truths form a gnostic system comprising a cosmology and a cyclical hierohistory. At the basis of the pre-Fāṭimid cosmology was a myth, only imperfectly reflected in the later sources, according to which the divine imperative *kun*, consisting of the letters *kāf* and *nūn*, through duplication formed the two original principles *kūnī ḳadar*. *Kūnī* was the female and *ḳadar* the male principle. The seven letters of *kūnī ḳadar* were known as the seven higher letters (*al-ḥurūf al-ʿulwiyya*), which are the archetypes of the seven messenger prophets and their revealed messages. From the two first principles proceeded three spiritual powers, *djadd*, *fatḥ*, and *khayāl*, identified with the three archangels Djibrāʾīl, Mīkāʾīl, and Isrāfīl, which mediate between the spiritual world and man in the physical world (on this triad see H. Corbin, *Le livre réunissant les deux sagesses*, Tehran-Paris 1953, *Étude préliminaire*, 91-112). The cyclical history progresses through seven eras, each inaugurated by an enunciator (*nāṭiḳ*) prophet bringing a revealed message. Each of the first six *nāṭiḳs*, Ādam, Nūḥ, Ibrāhīm, Mūsā, ʿĪsā, and Muḥammad, was followed by a fundament (*asās*) or silent one (*ṣāmit*), who revealed the *bāṭin* of the message, and by seven imāms. The seventh imām in each era rises in rank and becomes the *nāṭiḳ* of the following era, abrogating the law of the previous *nāṭiḳ* and bringing a new one. In the era of Muḥammad, ʿAlī was the *asās* and Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl the seventh imām. Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl on his reappearance in the near future will become the seventh *nāṭiḳ*, the Ḳāʾim or Mahdī [*q.v.*], and will abrogate the law of Islam. His message will, however, consist in the full revelation of the *bāṭin* truths without any *ẓāhir* law. He will rule the world and then end the physical world, sitting in judgment over humanity. During his absence he is represented by twelve *ḥudjdjas* residing in the twelve regions (*djazāʾir*) of the earth. The cyclical history was sometimes coupled with astrological speculations, and astrological predictions were made specifically concerning the date of the coming of the Ḳāʾim.

Before the coming of the Ḳāʾim the *bāṭin* must be kept secret and can be revealed to the neophyte only on swearing an oath of initiation with a vow of secrecy and on payment of a due. The initiation, known as *balāgh*, was no doubt gradual, but there is no evidence of a strictly fixed sequence of grades generally followed as described by anti-Ismāʿīlī sources. Beneath the imām and the *ḥudjdjas* a hierarchy of *dāʿīs* was in charge of the initiation and instruction (*daʿwa* [*q.v.*]). Little is known about the actual organization of the *daʿwa* in the pre-Fāṭimid and Fāṭimid age. The widely differing enumerations of the grades (*ḥudūd*) of the hierarchy given in Ismāʿīlī religious texts serve mostly ideal functions and cannot be taken as corresponding closely to the actual organization (see W. Ivanow, *The organization of the Fāṭimid propaganda*, in *JBBRAS*, xv (1939), 1-35).

From about the beginning of the 4th/10th century onwards the early cosmology was superseded and partially replaced by a cosmology of Neoplatonic origin, apparently first propounded by the *dāʿī* al-Nasafī [*q.v.*]. In this cosmology God is described as absolutely beyond comprehension, beyond any attribute or name, beyond being and non-being. Through his divine Order or Volition (*Amr*) he originated (*abdaʿ*) the Intellect (*ʿAḳl*). The *ʿAḳl* is the First Originated Being (*al-Mubdaʿ al-Awwal*), since the *Amr* is united with it in existence From the Intellect the Soul (*Nafs*) proceeds through emanation. From the Soul proceed the seven spheres with their stars and move with its movement. Through the revolution of the spheres the single elements (*al-mufradāt*) or natures, humidity, dryness, cold, and warmth, are mingled to form the composites (*al-murakkabāt*), earth, water, air, and ether. As the composites mingle, the plants with the vegetative (*nāmiya*) soul develop From them the animals with the sensitive (*ḥissiyya*) soul develop, and from the latter, man with the rational (*nāṭiḳa*) soul. Al-Nasafī's cosmology was generally adopted in its essentials, though refined and elaborated by the later authors. Some minor points aroused controversy among them. The principles of the spiritual world in this cosmology were identified with terms of the religious sphere. Thus the Intellect in religious terminology was equated with the Pen (*Ḳalam*) and the Throne (*ʿArsh*), and the Soul was identified with the Tablet (*Lawḥ*) and the Footstool (*Kursī*) etc. Much stressed were the analogies between the spiritual, astral, and physical worlds and between man as the

realpatidar.com

https://archive.org/details/bk1023/page/n10/mode/1up

1978 -Encyclopaedia of Islam -E J Brill -Vol IV (1023)

realpatidar.com

microcosm and the physical world as the macrocosm. The official Fāṭimid *daʿwa* apparently did not accept this cosmology until the time of the Caliph al-Muʿizz.

A somewhat different cosmological system was propounded by the *dāʿī* Ḥamīd al-Dīn al-Kirmānī [*q.v.*] (d. about 411/1021). Instead of the duality of the Intellect and the Soul his system comprises ten intellects in the spiritual world. The Soul is replaced by the Second Intellect or First Emanation (*al-Munbaʿiṯ al-Awwal*), proceeding from the higher relation (*al-nisba al-aṯraf*) of the First Intellect. The Third Intellect or Second Emanation and First Potential Being, proceeding from the lower relation (*al-nisba al-adwan*) of the First Intellect, is equated with matter and form (*al-hayūlā wa 'l-ṣūra*). From the First and Second Intellects proceed seven further intellects. The tenth one is the Active Intellect (*al-ʿAḳl al-Faʿʿāl*) or demiurge governing the physical world. The structure of the astral and the physical worlds and of the religious hierarchy were similarly modified by al-Kirmānī in close analogy to the spiritual world. The system of al-Kirmānī was not adopted by the Fāṭimid *daʿwa*. Only among the Ṭayyibīs in the Yemen did it replace the earlier traditional system.

Fāṭimid doctrine, because of the Fāṭimid claim to the imāmate, was forced to modify the early doctrine concerning the role of Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl as the final imām and Mahdī and the restriction of the number of imāms to seven. ʿUbayd Allāh al-Mahdī at first radically broke with this earlier doctrine by asserting that the imām after Djaʿfar al-Ṣādiḳ had been his son ʿAbd Allāh rather than Ismāʿīl and that the imāmate continued to be handed down among his descendants without restriction in number. Soon, however, attempts were made to accomodate the Fāṭimid claim to the imāmate with the earlier theory. Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl was again recognized as imām and as ancestor of the Fāṭimids. His return as the Ḳāʾim was sometimes interpreted spiritually, as being realized in the rise of the Fāṭimids, who would gradually fulfil the predictions concerning the Ḳāʾim. A second heptad of imāms, often called the deputies (*ḵẖulafāʾ*) of the Ḳāʾim, was admitted in the era of Muḥammad as a special privilege of the latter. The eschatological expectations in respect to the Ḳāʾim were to be fulfilled after the expiration of the second heptade of imāms. This theory also had to be abandoned as the Fāṭimid caliphate continued, though even then the eschatological events generally were expected in the near future (see W. Madelung, *Das Imamat in der frühen ismailitischen Lehre*, in *Isl.*, xxxvii (1961), 43-135).

Fāṭimid doctrine, in contrast to the pre-Fāṭimid attitude which tended to depreciate the *ẓāhir*, invariably insisted on the equal importance of the *ẓāhir* and the *bāṭin* and made every effort to suppress antinomian trends, which, however, often came to the surface among more radical Ismāʿīlī groups. The Ismāʿīlī *fiḳh* was elaborated chiefly by the Ḳāḍī al-Nuʿmān [*q.v.*] (d. 363/974), whose work *Daʿāʾim al-Islām* became the most authoritative exposition of it. Ismāʿīlī law agrees in general with Imāmī law, but does not permit the *mutʿa* [*q.v.*] temporary marriage and nullifies bequests to a legal heir except with the consent of the other heirs (see A. A. A. Fyzee, *Compendium of Fatimid Law*, Simla 1969). In the ritual, Ismāʿīlī *fiḳh* also agrees generally with Imāmī doctrine (see R. Strothmann, *Recht der Ismailiten*, in *Isl.*, xxxi (1954), 131-46). It gives, however, full authority to the imām for determining the beginning of a new month rather than requiring the sight of the new moon. In practice the beginning of the month was fixed by astronomical calculation. Thus it fell often one or two days earlier than for the other Muslims. This often led to friction in particular in respect to the beginning and end of the fasting month of Ramaḍān.

Post-Fāṭimid times. Ṭayyibī doctrine: The Ṭayyibī community in the Yemen and India preserved a large part of the Fāṭimid religious literature and retained the interest in the gnostic cosmology and cyclical history of the Fāṭimid age. Ṭayyibī doctrine, however, from the beginning adopted the cosmological system of al-Kirmānī in place of the traditional Fāṭimid system, and modified it by introducing a mythical "drama in heaven", first described by the second *dāʿī muṭlaḳ* Ibrāhīm al-Ḥāmidī [*q.v.*], which profoundly shaped the Ṭayyibī gnosis. According to this myth, the two emanations from the First Intellect, the Second and Third Intellects, were rivals for the second rank after the First Intellect. As the Second Intellect reached this position by his superior efforts, the Third Intellect refused to recognize his superiority in rank. In punishment for this failure he fell from the third rank behind the following seven intellects and, after repenting, became stabilized as the Tenth Intellect and demiurge (*mudabbir*). The physical world was produced out of the spiritual forms (*ṣuwar*) which together with the Tenth Intellect refused to recognize the superiority of the Second Intellect and out of the darkness generated by this sin. The Tenth Intellect, also called the Spiritual Ādam (*Ādam al-Rūḥānī*), tries to regain his original rank by calling the fallen spiritual forms to repentance. The first representative of his *daʿwa* on earth was the First and Universal Ādam (*Ādam al-Awwal al-Kullī*), owner of the body of the *ibdāʿ* world (*al-ḏjuṯẖṯẖa al-ibdāʿiyya*), who opened the first cycle of manifestation (*dawr al-kaṯf*) and is distinguished from the Partial Ādam (*Ādam al-Ḏjuzʾī*), who opened the present age of concealment (*dawr al-satr*). After his passing he rose to the horizon of the Tenth (Intellect) and took his place, while the Tenth rose in rank. Similarly the Ḳāʾim of each cycle after his passing rises and takes the place of the Tenth, who thus gradually rises until he will join the Second Intellect. Countless cycles of manifestation and concealment succeed each other until the Great Resurrection (*Ḳiyāmat al-Ḳiyāmāt*) which consummates the megacycle (*al-kawr al-aʿẓam*), sometimes specified to last 360,000 times 360,000 years.

The soul of each believer on his initiation is joined by a point of light, which grows as he advances in knowledge. On his passing it rises to join the soul of the holder of the rank (*ḥadd*) above him in the hierarchy. It continues to rise from *ḥadd* to *ḥadd* until it is gathered together with the souls of all other believers in the light temple (*haykal nūrānī*) in the shape of a human being which constitutes the form of the Ḳāʾim (*ṣūra Ḳāʾimiyya*) of his cycle, which then rises to the horizon of the Tenth. The souls of the unbelievers remain with their bodies, which are dissolved into anorganic matter which is consequently transformed into various harmful creatures and substances in descending order. Depending on the gravity of their sins they may eventually rise again through the ascending forms of life and as human beings may accept the *daʿwa* or end up in Sidjdjīn in torment lasting as long as the megacycle.

realpatidar.com

Continuing the Fāṭimid tradition Ṭayyibī doctrine

Link: http://www.realpatidar.com/library
email: mail@realpatidar.com

https://archive.org/details/bk1023/page/n11/mode/1up

1978 -Encyclopaedia of Islam -E J Brill -Vol IV (1023)

realpatidar.com

maintained the equal validity of the *ẓāhir* and the *bāṭin* and repudiated antinomian trends. Ḳāḍī al-Nuʿmān's *Daʿāʾim al-Islām* remained the authoritative work of *fiḳh*.

Nizārī doctrine: Owing to the upheavals in the political history of the Nizārī communities, their wide dispersal, the language barriers between them, and the repeated loss of large parts of their religious literature, Nizārī doctrine is marked by major shifts in time and nearly completely independent local traditions.

Doctrine of Alamūt: The vigorous activism of the movement led by Ḥasan-i Ṣabbāḥ even before its break with the Fāṭimid caliphate was associated with a new preaching (*daʿwa djadīda*), most eloquently formulated, though perhaps not originated, by Ḥasan-i Ṣabbāḥ himself. The new preaching entailed an apologetic reformulation of the old Shīʿī doctrine of *taʿlīm*, *i.e.*, the authoritative teaching in religion, which could be carried out only by a divinely chosen imām in every age after the Prophet. Ḥasan-i Ṣabbāḥ reaffirmed the need for such a teacher as a dictate of reason and went on to prove that only the Ismāʿīlī imām fulfilled this need. In his argumentation he seems to have stressed the autonomous authority of each imām, independent of his predecessors, thus unwittingly authorizing the later shifts of doctrine. The doctrine of *taʿlīm* had a strong impact in the Sunnī world, as is reflected by its elaborate refutation by al-Ghazālī [*q.v.*] and others.

A religious revolution took place under the fourth lord of Alamūt, Ḥasan *ʿalā dhikrihi al-salām* (557/1162-561/1166), who on 17 Ramaḍān 559/8 Aug. 1164 solemnly proclaimed the resurrection (*ḳiyāma*) in the name of the imām, whose *ḥudjdja* or deputy (*khalīfa*) he declared himself to be. In consonance with the Ismāʿīlī expectations concerning the *ḳiyāma* he announced the abrogation of the *sharīʿa*, which so far had been strictly enforced by the lords of Alamūt. The resurrection was interpreted spiritually as the manifestation of the unveiled Truth in the imām which actualized Paradise for the believers who could grasp it, while it condemned the non-Ismāʿīlī opponents to spiritual non-being, *i.e.*, Hell. After the murder of Ḥasan by a brother-in-law opposed to the abolition of the *sharīʿa*, the doctrine of the *ḳiyāma* was further elaborated by his son and successor Muḥammad (561/1166-607/1210). Ḥasan before his death seems to have hinted that he himself was the imām at least spiritually. Muḥammad now maintained that his father had been the imām also by physical descent, apparently alleging that he was the son of a descendant of Imām Nizār who had secretly found refuge in Alamūt. The line of imāms thus continued through Ḥasan and Muḥammad in the lords of Alamūt. Muḥammad put the imām, and specifically the present imām, at the centre of the doctrine of the *ḳiyāma*. The resurrection consisted in viewing God in the spiritual reality of the imām. This doctrine entailed the exaltation of the imām over the prophet, which became characteristic of Nizārī thought. At the same time a new figure, the imām-ḳāʾim, was introduced in the cyclical history. The imām-ḳāʾim in the various eras was identified as Melchizedek (Malik al-Salām), Dhu 'l-Ḳarnayn, Khiḍr, Maʿadd, and, in the era of Muḥammad, as ʿAlī. He was recognized by the prophets in each era as the locus of the divinity. In the *ḳiyāma* the imām-ḳāʾim, i.e., the present imām, who is identical with ʿAlī, appears openly in his spiritual reality to the believer, who in his spiritual relationship to the imām is identical with Salmān [*q.v.*]. The ranks of the teaching hierarchy intervening between the imām and the believer have, also in agreement with the Ismāʿīlī expectations concerning the *ḳiyāma*, faded away. There are only three categories of men left: the opponents (*ahl al-taḍādd*) of the imām who adhere to the *sharīʿa*, the ordinary followers of the imām or people of gradation (*ahl al-tarattub*), who have gone beyond the *sharīʿa* to the *bāṭin* and have found partial truth, and the people of union (*ahl al-waḥda*), who see the imām in his true nature discarding all appearances and have reached the realm of full truth. The *ḳiyāma* doctrine was clearly influenced by Ṣūfī ideas and terminology and prepared the way for the close relationship between later Nizārī Ismāʿīlism and Ṣūfism.

The *ḳiyāma* doctrine was repudiated by Muḥammad's son and successor Djalāl al-Dīn Ḥasan (607/1210-618/1221), who proclaimed his adherence to Sunnī Islam, publicly cursed his predecessors, and imposed the Sunnī *sharīʿa* on his followers, inviting Sunnī scholars to instruct him. As he continued to be considered by them as the imām, his orders were accepted without opposition. There is evidence that at least before his death he acted towards his followers again in the fashion of an Ismāʿīlī imām. Under his son ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Muḥammad (618/1221-653/1255) the enforcement of the *sharīʿa* was relaxed, though it was not officially abolished. The adjusted doctrine which now was developed to explain the new religious situation is expounded in the contemporary Ismāʿīlī works of Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī [*q.v.*]. The reimposition of the *sharīʿa* by Djalāl al-Dīn Ḥasan was interpreted as a return to precautionary dissimulation (*taḳiyya*) and a new period of concealment (*satr*), when the truth is hidden in the *bāṭin*, in contrast to the preceding period of *ḳiyāma*, when the unveiled truth was apparent and available to all. The *ḳiyāma* proclaimed by Ḥasan *ʿalā dhikrihi 'l-salām*, coming at about the middle of the millenium of the era of the Prophet Muḥammad, was merely anticipatory of the final *ḳiyāma* at the end of it. In the era of Muḥammad periods of *satr* and *ḳiyāma* may alternate according to the decision of each imām, since every imām is a potential imām-ḳāʾim. The state of spiritual union (*waḥda*) in the time of *satr* is restricted to the *ḥudjdja* of the imām, who partakes of the divine Support (*taʾyīd*) and possesses the truth of the imām, with whom he is consubstantial. The *ahl al-tarattub* are divided into the strong (*aḳwiyāʾ*) and the weak (*ḍuʿafāʾ*) according to their closeness to the truth.

Conditions in the post-Alamūt period favoured the adoption of Ṣūfī ways of life by the imāms and their followers also externally. Ismāʿīlī ideas were often camouflaged in Ṣūfī forms of expression, especially in poetry. Doctrinal works were written again from the 9th/16th century on, at a time when the victory of Shīʿism in Persia permitted the Nizārīs and their imāms to act somewhat more openly. The doctrine of the late Alamūt period as expressed by Nāṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī was essentially retained. Works of the Fāṭimid age, which still influenced al-Ṭūsī, were no longer available. Interest in the Ismāʿīlī cosmology and cyclical history waned. The role of the *ḥudjdja* as the revealer of the spiritual truth and only access to the essence of the imām, already stressed by al-Ṭūsī, was further elaborated.

A special literary tradition within Nizārī Ismāʿīlism in Persian was retained by the community of Badakhshān. Although many works of the Alamūt and post-Alamūt period found their way there, the community remained particularly attached to the works, genuine and spurious, of Nāṣir-i Khusraw,

realpatidar.com

Link: http://www.realpatidar.com/library
email: mail@realpatidar.com

https://archive.org/details/bk1023/page/n12/mode/1up

1978 -Encyclopaedia of Islam -E J Brill -Vol IV (1023)

realpatidar.com

Fāṭimid doctrine in the adaptation of Nāṣir, including the Fāṭimid cosmology, thus maintained their influence. The community of Badakhshān also transmitted and revered the *Umm al-kitāb* representing largely non-Ismāʿīlī thought.

Syrian Nizārī literature, written in Arabic, developed independently of the Persian literature, even during the Alamūt period. Persian works were not translated into Arabic or vice-versa. The Syrian community preserved a substantial selection of Fāṭimid religious literature, partially different from those preserved by the Ṭayyibīs. Even though the *ḳiyāma* was proclaimed, apparently with some delay, in Syria, the *ḳiyāma* doctrine had practically no impact there. The scholarly doctrine continued mostly in the Fāṭimid tradition. Syrian doctrinal works, while concentrating on the traditional cosmology and cyclical history, virtually ignore the current imām, the central figure in the Persian Alamūt and post-Alamūt doctrine. In religious literature of a popular type Rāshid al-Dīn Sinān is extolled as a saintly hero and his cosmic rank is described in terms appropriate to the imām. Much of the Syrian Ismāʿīlī literature was destroyed later during the feuds with neighbouring communities.

Among the Khodjas Ismāʿīlī literature, both Persian and Arabic, has been virtually unknown. Only a single Persian work, the *Pandiyāt-i Djavānmardī* containing a collection of religious and moral admonitions of the Nizārī Imām al-Mustanṣir (end of the 9th/15th century), was accepted as a sacred book, perhaps a century after his death. The traditional religious literature of the Khodjas and the Imām Shāhis is known as Satpanth [*q.v.*] literature, Sat Panth, *i.e.*, True Path, designating the religion preached in it. It consists of numerous writings in verse form, called *gnans*, written in, or translated into, several Indian languages. Most of them are ascribed to the medieval *pīrs*, but cannot be dated exactly and probably have undergone changes in the transmission. They contain hymns, moral and religious instruction, legendary histories of the *pīrs*, and descriptions of their miracles, but no formulated creed or theology. Their religious content is a mixture of Islamic and Hindu, especially popular Tantric, elements. While idol worship is condemned, Hindu mythology is accepted. ʿAlī is described as the Tenth Avatar or incarnation of the deity, and the imāms are identical with him. The Ḳurʾān is considered the last of the Vedas, which are viewed as holy scriptures whose true interpretation is known to the *pīrs*. The religious role of the *pīr* or *guru* is extolled. Acceptance of the true religion will free the believer from further rebirths and open Paradise for him, which is described in Islamic terms, while those failing to recognize the imāms must pass through another cycle of rebirths. The traditional Ismāʿīlī cosmology, cyclical history, and hierarchy are unknown (see W. Ivanow, *Satpanth*, in *Collectanea* I (The Ismaili Society), Leiden 1948, 1-54).

Bibliography in addition to the works cited in the article: Major aspects of early Ismāʿīlī history and doctrine are examined in: B. Lewis, *The origins of Ismāʿīlism*, Cambridge 1940; W. Ivanow, *Ismaili tradition concerning the rise of the Fatimids*, London 1942; idem, *Studies in early Persian Ismailism*², Bombay 1955; S. M. Stern, *Heterodox Ismailism in the time of al-Muʿizz*, in *BSOAS*, xvii (1955), 10-30. On Nizārī history and doctrine in the Alamūt period: M. G. S. Hodgson, *The order of Assassins*, The Hague 1955, (fundamental); idem, *The Ismāʿīlī state*, in *The Cambridge History of Iran*, v, Cambridge 1968, 422-82; B. Lewis, *The Assassins*, London 1967. On the Syrian Nizārīs in the time of the crusades: B. Lewis, *The Ismāʿīlis and the Assassins*, in K. M. Setton (ed.), *A history of the Crusades*, i, Philadelphia 1955, 99-132. On the history, doctrine, and present state of the Bohorās and Khodjas: J. N. Hollister, *The Shīʿa of India*, London 1953. Analysis of Ismāʿīli gnostic doctrine: H. Corbin, *De la gnose antique à la gnose ismaélienne*, in *Convegno di scienze morali storiche e filologiche 1956*, Rome 1957, 105-46; idem, *Histoire de la philosophie islamique*, i, Paris 1964, 110-51. Analytical bibliography of published and unpublished Ismāʿīlī works: W. Ivanow, *Ismaili Literature*, Tehran 1963. General, but unequal surveys of Ismāʿīlī history and doctrine have been given by W. Ivanow, *Brief survey of the evolution of Ismailism*, Leiden 1952; M. Kāmil Ḥusayn, *Ṭāʾifat al-Ismāʿiliyya*, Cairo 1959.

(W. MADELUNG)

ISMĀʿĪLIYYA, town in Egypt on the western bank of the Suez Canal and on the northern shore of Lake Timsāḥ. The town originated from huts of workers and engineers engaged in excavating the Suez Canal. Its foundations were laid by the Inspector General of the Suez Canal Company on 27 April 1862. After the succession of the Khedive Ismāʿīl to the throne on 18 January 1863 it was called Ismāʿīliyya. In 1864 a network of streets and quarters, a central square (*maydān*), a government building (*sarāy*) and a pump for water-supply were established, and in 1868 the town was connected to the Egyptian railway network. When the digging of the Canal was completed, most of the personnel engaged on it moved to Port Saʿīd, and from 1870 onwards the number of Ismāʿīliyya's inhabitants was unchanged (about 3,000) for almost two decades. From the 1890s the town grew steadily to more than 15,000 inhabitants after World War I and more than 50,000 after World War II. From World War I until the final evacuation of British troops in the 1950s, a large British army and airforce base was situated near Ismāʿīliyya, and many foreign residents dwelt in the town. In 1928 Ḥasan al-Bannāʾ [*q.v.*] founded in Ismāʿīliyya the movement of al-Ikhwān al-Muslimūn [*q.v.*]. After the unilateral abrogation of the Anglo-Egyptian treaty of 1936 in October 1951, Ismāʿīliyya became the scene of frequent clashes between British troops and Egyptian police, culminating in a six-hour battle on 25 January 1952. This resulted, one day later, in the Cairo riots known as "black Saturday".

Until 1960 Ismāʿīliyya formed part of the Canal Governorate, but in that year it became the centre of a separate province (*muḥāfaẓa*) which included al-Ḳanṭara to the north and al-Tall al-Kabīr to the west. In 1966 the number of inhabitants of Ismāʿīliyya province amounted to 344,789, of whom 162,370 dwelt in rural settlements (*rīf*) and 182, 419 in urban ones (*ḥaḍar*). After the war of June 1967 most of Ismāʿīliyya's inhabitants left the city or were evacuated.

Bibliography: ʿAlī Mubārak, *al-Khiṭaṭ al-djadīda*, viii, Cairo 1305, 59; H. de Vaujany, *Alexandrie et la Basse-Égypte*, Paris 1885, 245; Population censuses of Egypt, 1897-1966; *al-Ahrām*, October 1951-January 1952, and 26 July 1965.

(G. BAER)

ISNA, Arabic name of a town in Upper Egypt (Egyptian Te-snet, Coptic Sne; Greek Latopolis, from the fish Latos worshipped there; in European accounts Esne, Esnèh), lying on the left bank of

realpatidar.com